



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/233,249	01/19/99	PUTMAN H	B-1056

RALPH E JOCKE
WALKER & JOCKE
231 SOUTH BROADWAY
MEDINA OH 44256

TM11/0523

EXAMINER
CARLSON, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/233,249

Applicant(s)

PUTMAN, HAROLD V.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 21, 22, 27, 32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claims 21 and 22 cannot be fully understood due to the confusing nature of the "includes at least one output indicative instruction operative to indicate at least one element" language. It is unclear what disclosed feature this is referring to.
- Claims 27, 32 and 40, it is unclear whether these are apparatus or method claims. Applicant should not present an article claim which is depends from a method claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosak (XML, Java, and the future of the web). Bosak teaches the basics of xml and style

Art Unit: 2162

sheets. Xml documents provide the code for clients (internet-connected computers with browsers) to display a page/interface. The xml documents merely specify the content of the screen/interface/page, leaving the particular formatting/screen arrangement to the data from the style sheets. This enables a single xml document to determine the same content, yet be displayed/rendered differently on various different output devices such as screens and paper printing via the style sheets. Any xml document with clickable links, selectable fields, buttons, etc are taken to inherently provide an interface output. Also, the web connected computers required for xml viewing are taken to inherently include standard input devices such as keyboards and mouse. Mere button clicking triggers an event which causes at the very least, the button to be re-drawn on the interface screen as indented or "pushed" while it is being clicked. This inherent event is provided by the browser.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12~~12~~¹¹-22 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosak. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided standard printers and driver software with the types of computers described by Bosak so that users could make printouts of the various

screens. A standard printer is taken to meet applicant's "transaction function device" of these claims; a print job can be sent to the printer using different input means such as with a mouse or with a keyboard as is well known, relying on an input device to trigger a print event handled by known print event processors in software. As is known, on-screen indicators are presented to the user indicating a print job has started. Further, web-connected kiosks are well known to include touch screens; such are capable of processing Bosak's xml documents. The distributed clients' software (browser) that interpret the documents described by Bosak allow processing of the xml documents to be platform independent as described within. Providing a second computer with a different operating system to process the same xml documents is suggested by Bosak. To have provided different monitor types and/or sizes would have been obvious for the various network-connected end users as is well known. Regarding the character based vs. graphical displays, standard monitor screens display pixels, whether representing characters or graphics. A well known and standard graphical display is also taken to be a character display device, depending on the screen contents to be rendered.

Claims 1-11, 23-27 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivett-Carnac (An Object-Oriented Framework for Transaction Capture Using Co-operating Business Rule Components) in view of Bosak. Rivett-Carnac teaches a framework for transaction processing systems for a bank where the user interface is decoupled from the business logic. This allows the business rules to be developed and/or changed independent of the GUI. The framework includes

Art Unit: 2162

interface objects such as transaction fields that are coupled to business rules for validations. When the user interacts with the system via the input device(s), events are triggered which change stored values and which also changes the interface display.

"This requires framework mechanisms for notification of changes to fields entered by the user, triggering of rule processing to validate the entry and recalculate dependant data, updating the GUI display and informing the user of any warnings or errors which may arise" [section 3.2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have included operable action menus as part of the interface as these are well known GUI techniques that end users would be comfortable with.

Section 3.1 describes that the various rules may be modularly implemented via library functions (DLL/subroutines). Page 133 describes when an attribute's value is changed by a user (via input device), an event is triggered (change warning) which is handled by an event handler (event processor). The GUI is described on page 134 as being flexible and independent of end user platform. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided such a banking transaction system with xml and style sheets as described by Bosak so that the data handling and transaction logic can be constructed without regard to output/interface, relying on style sheets to define the arrangement of the xml content. This would enable various different end user machines to access the system without requiring redesign specific to the end user hardware. Such an approach would be obvious for an ATM cash dispensing machine so that many geographically dispersed machines (end users) can

Art Unit: 2162

access the financial transaction system over a controlled network. The user input would trigger an event processor to operate the cash dispenser.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6p, off on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6306 for regular communications and 703-308-6306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Jeffrey D. Carlson
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

jdc
May 18, 2001